

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office action dated May 29, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks submitted with a request for continued examination ("RCE"). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-15, 18-22 and 26-33 were pending in the present Application. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-15, 18-22 and 26-33 are cancelled by the above amendments. New claims 34-46 have been added. Support for new claims 34-46 may be found throughout the specification, figures and claims as originally filed. Claims 34-46 are pending for further consideration upon entry of the present amendment.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings stand objected to for allegedly failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner specifically states that the drawings fail to show features of claims 1 and 32. Applicants respectfully note that claims 1 and 32 have been cancelled.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objections to the drawings in light of the cancellation of claims 1 and 32.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 14, 30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to be fully enabled by the specification as filed. Applicants respectfully note that claims 14, 30 and 32 have been cancelled, rendering any rejections thereto moot.

In light of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 14, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1, 7 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1, 7 and 27 have been cancelled, rendering any rejections thereto moot.

In light of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1274 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 1, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33

Claims 1, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Nagata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,410, hereinafter “Nagata”). Applicants respectfully note that claims 1, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33 have been cancelled, rendering any rejection thereto moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33 in view of Nagata.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,288, hereinafter “Kim”). Applicants respectfully note that claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33 have been cancelled, rendering any rejections thereto moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 18-22, 26-29 and 31-33 in view of Kim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all of the elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art, and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. See MPEP 2143.

Claim 30

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nagata or Kim in view of Nishiki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,620, hereinafter “Nishiki”). The Examiner states that Nagata or Kim discloses all of the elements of claim 30 except, *a liquid crystal device comprising a shorting bar intersecting the data lines and the first driving signal line, wherein the shorting bar is configured to be removed by edge grinding along a cutting line*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 1 of Nishiki. Applicants respectfully note that claim 30 has been cancelled, rendering any rejections thereto moot. However, Applicants include a short statement herein addressing the Examiner’s “Response to Arguments” provided on pages 21-25 of the present Final Office action.

The Examiner states, “Applicants ONLY arguments are follows” and then proceeds to list only a portion of Applicants arguments. (See page 21 of the Final Office action). The Examiner does not address the improper combination of Kim and Nishiki under 35 U.S.C. §103(c) as discussed in detail in the previous response and as resubmitted herein for the Examiner’s reference:

Applicants respectfully note that the subject matter of Kim is commonly owned by the Applicants of the present application and that Kim is believed to qualify as prior art only under subsection (e) of 35 U.S.C. §102. The subject matter of Kim and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person, namely the Applicants. Therefore, it is believed that the subject matter of Kim may not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as per 35 U.S.C. §103(c).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of claim 30 in view of Nagata or Kim in view of Nishiki.

Newly Introduced Claims

Nagata is directed to a collective substrate of active-matrix substrates, a manufacturing method thereof and an inspection method thereof. The collective substrate is divided into a first block and a second block. Cells of the first block and second block form a corresponding signal input pad group wherein an inspection scanning signal is input via a scanning-line short ring connection line to the scanning lines, and an inspection display signal is input via a signal-line short ring connecting line to signal lines, and an auxiliary capacity wire signal is input via an auxiliary capacity wire main wire connecting line to auxiliary capacity wires. (See Abstract and FIG. 17).

Kim is directed to a liquid crystal display including gate signal interconnection wires formed at a corner portion of a substrate and outside the display area to transmit gate electrical signals, and provided with gate signal interconnection lines and first and second gate signal interconnection pads connected to both ends of the gate signal interconnection lines. (See Abstract and FIG. 1).

Nishiki is directed to an active matrix substrate. (See Abstract).

With respect to the newly introduced claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Nagata, Kim and Nishiki, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest: **a driving signal wire which transmits driving signals from an outside of the substrate to the gate driver and which comprises a first protrusion portion extended toward the gate pad, wherein the gate pad comprises a second protrusion portion extended toward the driving signal wire and the first protrusion portion is adjacent to and insulated from the second protrusion as claimed in independent claim 34 or a plurality of first connecting portions disposed between the first driving signal wire and the gate pad of each of the plurality of gate lines, wherein a first end of each of the plurality of first connecting portions is connected to the first driving signal wire and a second end of each of the plurality of first connecting portions is connected to the gate pad and each of the plurality of first connecting portions is divided into two parts as claimed in independent claim 39.**

Claims 35-38 depend from independent claim 34, and thus include all of the limitations of claim 34. Claims 40-46 depend from independent claim 39, and thus include all of the limitations of claim 39. It is thus believed that the dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claims 34 and 39, which are believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 34-46.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /John W. Stankiewicz/
Amy Bizon-Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
John W. Stankiewicz
Reg. No. 60,169
Confirmation No. 8963
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: September 29, 2009